Water Baptism

Book 1

By
Pastor V.S. Herrell

Water Baptism

By
Pastor V.S. Herrell

2nd Edition

Prepared by The Evangelistic
Committee of the
Christian Separatist Church
P.O. Box 188
Kodak, TN 37764

Published by:
Herrell Brothers Publishing House
P.O. Box 130, Kodak, TN 37764
© 2001, Herrell Brothers Publishing House

Scripture taken from THE NEW TESTAMENT: THE ANOINTED STANDARD TRANSLATION (AST), 2nd Edition, unless otherwise noted.
Copyright © 1995, 2001 HBPH. Used by permission of HBPH.

Table of Contents

Introduction 3
The Baptism of Fire 4
Etymological Evidence 9
Buried With Christ Through Baptism 24
Bible Does Not Teach 34
It is Time to Expose 37
The Historical Background 39
The Talmudic Jewish Rabbis Argued 48
The Conversion And Baptism Of Paul
Ananias Offers Paul as a Lamb of God 56
The Baptism of the Twelve 67
The Adoption Or Christing Of Jesus 79
The Occasion And Place Of Origin 85
The Event 87
Principles Of Baptism Further Exemplified 90
The Separation of the Apostles of John 96

Introduction

The following is a compilation of articles written by Pastor Herrell. We have assembled what we consider the best of these articles that deal most directly with the subject of water baptism. Pastor Herrell has written quite a number of other articles related to the subject, including Infant Baptism and the Baptism of Children. But these sermons raise vital questions for the Christian believer and point out deficiencies of Catholic and Judeo theology. It is the hope of the Separatist Communion that anyone reading Pastor Herrell's commentary on Water Baptism will complete their study of the subject by reading Pastor Herrell's book *The Baptism of Fire.*

The Baptism of Fire

Let us begin this examination by affirming the necessity of Christian Baptism. The Judeo Scriptures teach that, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned" (Mark 16:16), and while as Separatists we know this to be an interpolation not in the Bible, it is still valuable in that it is a good statement of principle if you are deceived into believing in water baptismal regeneration because it catches the perverters of Scripture and those who, through the centuries, have sought to impose their pagan theology upon Christianity red-handed and guilty of blaspheming the doctrines of true Christianity.

But if we truly understand what baptism is and how the word *baptism* was used in the Greek by Christ and His Holy Apostles, then we know that it was always in reference to a separating washing, and then we are better able to understand that there is no such thing as physical water baptismal regeneration. Today, most professing Christians are actually practicing pagan religion that has nothing to do with Christianity. The practice of paganized and Judeoized "Christianity" is clearly predicated upon certain Judeo theological assumptions. It is assumed by the theologians that all of the early, so-called church fathers were actually Christians. However, when the writings of these so-called theologians are studied in the light of what the Christian Scriptures actually say and teach, one cannot escape the inevitable conclusion that many of the revered so-called church fathers were actually mixing pagan philosophy with the teachings of Christ. Mark 16:16 is an example of the kind of Syncretic mentality that

will stop at nothing to Judeoize and paganize Christianity. We owe a great debt to the early pagan Catholics for their institutionalizing the idea of water baptismal regeneration, and a similar debt to many modern Protestant religious organizations for perpetuating the same paganization of Christianity. I am persuaded that someday soon the sons of God will be able to repay that debt, now long overdue. Be that as it may, today we know beyond a shadow of a doubt that the Bible does not teach water baptismal regeneration, nor any other kind of ritualistic regeneration. We know by the authority of the Scriptures that the one, true baptism taught by Christianity is being baptized by the washing of the Fire of the Mentality of the Living Word of God. It is not necessarily something that occurs in one day or one hour, but regeneration does have a beginning summed up in the word "belief."

My purpose here is to bring some clarity of mind to the muddled and mongrelized thinking of professing Christians, and to aid them in escaping the waters of Babylon. So we might say that all that we may say on the subject of water baptism is the act of seeking to baptize people with the truth of God's Word. Therefore, we acknowledge that Baptism is indeed a sacred necessity set in the Holy Congregation of the Militant Church of Jesus Christ for His chosen race. Thus, the purpose herein is not to deny the Biblical necessity of Christian baptism, but rather to bring to the light of truth the gross deception perpetrated by the Humanist forces of antichrists, known as "Christian Fundamentalists", regarding the mode and meaning of the administration of Holy Baptism and its sacred Scriptural meaning and purpose.

At this hour in history, the majority of

Americans accept what is called "fundamentalist Christianity" and its creed as representative of Bible truth, but in the reality of the Scriptures, nothing could be further from the truth. Fundamentalism is extremely deceptive, inasmuch as its tenets of supposed Christian faith are even accepted by those who say that they oppose it. These devilish forces have deceived the vast majority of the civilized nations on a variety of Biblical issues such as being "born again", and they have done so by distorting the truth about water baptisms through half truths and damnable and blasphemous twistings of the Scriptures.

Our Lord has declared that the truth of His Word is the way and means to freedom from the shackles of antichrist Judeoism and its deception. He has told us clearly that **"... If you continue in My Word, you are truly My students. And you will know the truth, and truth will set you free"** (John 8:31-32 AST). In plain language this means that the Living Christ has no disciples that do not continue in His Word. It is a simple truth that not to be in the Word is to be out of the Word. To be out of the Word is to be in disagreement with the Word. To be in disagreement is to be out of the Communion of Christ. Christ rules His government of His people by His Word. Those who are His do not engage in subjective theories or traditions of men. Nor, are they ruled by feelings or subjective emotional reasoning dictated by human sentimentality.

Our Master has also said: **"And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, I will draw all to Myself"** (John 12:32 AST). It is our contention herein, that these two principles of scripture cannot be compromised. Men who will know the truth must continue in our Master's Word, for only the uplifted

Christ is the focal point for true Christian unity, as well as salvation, both personal and racial. This principle is explicitly stated in John 3:14-15, **"And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the desert, so too must the Son of man be lifted up, that everyone being persuaded in Him may not perish, but have life everlasting"** (AST). In this treatise, we have but one basic motive, that is to continue in His Word and ask men to return to their first love in our generation, and at the same time, to share the truth that makes men free, that the sons of Adam may truly become the sons of the Living God as they awaken from their grave of death unto the responsibility of rulership in the Government of God.

The Christian people have been seduced by the spirit of procrastination when it comes to the study of the Word of the Living God. This spirit of procrastination has robbed them of their authority and long since divided and conquered most of the Christian kingdom. Our Lord has said: **"The thief does not come except that he may steal, and kill, and destroy. I came that they may have life and may have it abundantly"** (John 10:10 AST).

The majority of Protestant, Catholic and Greek Orthodox Christians reject the teaching and practice of baptism by full-body immersion. This fact in itself proves nothing. But it does impose a responsibility upon the full-body immersionists to rationally consider, in an objective way, the historical Christian majority's interpretation on the subject of baptism, if for no other reason than to gain understanding.

On the other hand, there is as much responsibility imposed on the "Christian majority", who teach that baptism is by effusion – that is to

say, sprinkling or pouring – to consider the points of view of the full-body immersionists. As Christian Separatists, we contend that if both of these opposing and warring schools of theological thought would dare to **"let God be true and every man a liar"** (Romans 3:4 AST) while laying aside their traditions of men and orthodoxy (which have made the Word of God, and the faith of God, and the commandments of God and the promises of God and the cause of Christ of no effect[1]), they would soon find that **neither extreme has the true gospel of Christ and certainly not the truth about Baptism**. This statement may be shocking and it will, no doubt, startle and offend some who are caught up in the strong illusions of Talmudic inspired Judeoism, nevertheless it is the truth!

Therefore, it is our intention, to show from God's Word, the Bible, that both the full-body immersionists as well as the sprinklers and pourers who teach water baptismal regeneration are dead wrong and have been teaching false gospels, in the hope that many of God's people will come out of the mysterious Babylonian systems of religion into the marvelous light of the Everlasting Covenant of our Father. We shall endeavor to earnestly consider all points of view as rationally as possible. We shall weigh them in the righteous balance of the Living Word of God, as well as the historical and Biblical facts relating to the subject.

---

[1] Matthew 15:6, Mark 7:13, Romans 3:3, I Corinthians 1:17, and Galatians 5:4.

Etymological Evidence

Let us now turn to consider the etymological history of the word *baptizo* as we survey its usage in the Septuagint Old Testament and the New Testament. The words *baptizo* and *bapto* and their related words are used in the ancient texts with such great latitude as to uphold the conclusion that the command to baptize by means of immersion is utterly false and unauthorized.

Since the Reformation and the subsequent rise of the Baptist cults in the late 1600's as distinct denominations and their tenet of "baptizing by dipping," the meanings of the Greek words in question have been a matter of dispute. Baptist so-called Greek scholars have thought of innumerable ways of changing the previous definitions given the words, and their successors have been confused by the contradictory definitions of the previous works so as to create a broader definition to encompass both. But looking at the classic use of the words in question, it is evident that *bapto* means (1) to dip; (2) to dye by dipping; (3) to dye in general without a specific mode; (4) to gild or glaze, as in pottery; (5) to wet or wash; (6) to temper, as in tempering hot iron, which was often done by pouring or dipping; (7) and to imbue or permeate, as the mind is said to be baptized with fantasies (*upo ton phantasion*) and not dipped into them. This example is also seen in the phrase "imbued with righteousness," for one cannot be dipped in righteousness but is rather permeated with it or imbued with it. Thus, from looking at these definitions, it has to at least be granted that the command to baptize, which is given with the word *bapto*, is not restricted to plunging,

immersing, or dipping.

Next, for *baptizo,* we find, (1) to immerse or submerge (i.e., the word is used of ships being sunk or buried at sea; we also learn that immersion was the primary mode of initiation into most of the pagan mystery cults. This is significant when contrasted with the waters of separation and ritual of separation performed in ancient Israel, since there it is testified by Scripture that the Israelites employed ablutions and never immersed a priest or a prophet; in fact, this distinction was one of the things that distinguished Israel from the pagan nations surrounding them.); (2) to cover with water (as an increasing tide covers the beach); (3) to moisten or dampen; (4) to pour upon or soak; (5) to be overwhelmed or overpowered (i.e., men are said to be baptized with a number of things: such as wine, the phrase for intoxication being *oi bebaptismenoi*. Men are also said to be baptized in opium, debts, or conundrums, such as riddles, puzzles, or other enthusiasms, all of which overwhelm the mind and create an obsession or a focused fanaticism. In other words, they are used metaphorically of the mind being intoxicated by a secular or religious philosophy. The effect of such an overwhelming intoxication is that seen in Revelation 14:8: **"And another, second messenger followed, saying, 'Fallen! Fallen is Babylon the great city! Because of the wine of the anger of her whoredom she made all nations to drink"** (AST). Furthermore, wine is itself said to be baptized when it has water poured into it. Thus, here again, no particular mode is necessarily indicated.

What we learn from this study is that the word *baptizo* indicates a certain effect but not a certain way

of achieving that effect. We have many words like this in English. For example, the word "baptize" in Greek (*baptizo*) is like the word "kill" in English. The word kill indicates a desired goal when issued, but it does not indicate a method of doing it. The one told to do so could strangle, stab, or any of another million imaginative ways so long as the actions results in death. Thus too, the word *baptize* in Greek was to produce a certain effect, that of *baptism*, but no particular mode is indicated.

In the Septuagint, the words occur only rarely. Among these rare occurrences though are some that are very important to understanding the meaning of the words. For example, in II Kings 5:10-14, we find the account of Naaman the Syrian who came to the prophet to be healed of leprosy. In verse 10, we read, **"And Elisha sent a messenger to him, saying, 'Go and wash seven times in the Jordan'"** (LXX). This *wash* is translated for the Greek word *lousai*. In verse 14, however, we read, **"So Naiman went down, and dipped himself seven times in Jordan"** (LXX). This *dipped* is translated for the Greek word *abaptisato*, a cognate of *baptizo*. What this indicates is not that *lousai* is an equivalent and synonymous term with the supposed definition of *baptizo*, for we know unequivocally and without dispute that *lousai* means *to wash* and *to wash* alone. What it does indicate, however, is that *baptizo* is synonymous with the real meaning of *lousai*. Thus, *baptizo* in the Septuagint carried the general meaning of *to wash with water* and thus translating as *dipped* would not be as correct as to translate it as *washed with water*. This link of the two words being synonymous is made even stronger in the Vulgate translation of this passage which uses a form of *lavare* for both verses. In Daniel 4:30, we read that

the body of Nebuchadnezzar was **"bathed with the dew of heaven"** (LXX). *Bathed* is translated for *ebaphe*, a form of *baptizo*, and this sentence, by implication of the physical circumstances, excludes the possibility of dipping. Thus, in the Septuagint, we see that *baptizo* finds its best definition in *to wash*.

The word *bapto* in the Septuagint does often carry the idea of immersing, but not the entire body. Touching the water or immersing a small part of the body most often is what the word requires. In Leviticus 4:17, we read that the **"priest shall dip his finger into some of the blood"** (LXX). The word *dip* here is translated for *bapsei*, and while the word *dip* can be correctly used for the translation, the dipping is not into water and it is no more than the end of a finger. Another example of this type of dipping occurs in Ruth 2:14, where we read of Boaz telling Ruth **"dip** (*bapseis*) **thy morsel in the vinegar"** (LXX). Again in Joshua 3:15, **"The feet of the priests that bore the ark of the covenant of the Lord were dipped** (*ebaphesan*) **in part of the water"** (LXX). In I Samuel 14:27, Jonathan **"dipped"** (*ebapsen*) the rod he held in honey-comb. Thus, what we learn from these Scriptures is that while *bapto* is occasionally used in the Septuagint with the meaning of "to dip," even then it does not mean or imply full-body immersion, but on the contrary, submergence of a small part of the body.

In Leviticus 14:6, we read,

> **"And as for the living bird he shall take it, and the cedar wood, and the hyssop, and he shall dip (*bapsei*) them and the living bird in the blood of the bird that was slain over running water"** (LXX).

Again, here we see that it is physically impossible for all of these things to be submerged in the blood of a bird and instead of translating *bapsei* as *dip* it would be more correct to translate it with a word expressing *clean* or *moisten*.

Unlike *bapto*, *baptizo* occurs far less in the Septuagint. It has only four occurrences, once in II Kings 5:14 which we discussed above and again in Isaiah 21:4 where the Greek has *e anomia me baptizei* or literally **"Lawlessness baptizes me."** The King James Version, following the Masoretic text, has "Fearfulness affrighted me." But the Vulgate, partially translated from the Septuagint, preserves for us perhaps the best meaning of the word with the Latin word *stupefecerunt* which means *to astound* or *to stupify*. Thus, a good translation for the Greek above would be *lawlessness overwhelmed me*. The two other occurrences in the Septuagint are in what is commonly known as the *Apocrypha*, which to us basically means that they are not in the Masoretic Hebrew text. These occurrences are in Judith 12:7 and Sirach 34:27, and the former passage in Judith reads, **"She baptized herself in the camp at a fountain of water"** (*ebaptizeto en te parembole epi tes peges tou udatos*). While this passage does not specifically qualify the meaning of *baptizo* in any respect, we can use logic to discover its meaning. If the word means *to submerge* then the passage is suggesting that she submerged herself in the camp fountain. If the word does not mean *to submerge*, but merely *to wash* or *to clean*, then Judith simply washed herself at the fountain.

But let us look a little deeper. When this passage takes place, the land was under the control of Holofernes, an Assyrian commander, and the Assyrians had overrun the villages. Out of

desperation for her people, Judith went to the king and told him that she would help him in his conquest of the land. Holofernes was captivated by her beauty and treated her with great favor. She went back to her tent where she was left alone for three days but was permitted at night to go to the fountain for "baptism" or *purification.* On the fourth night, she was allowed to come to a feast by the order of Holofernes where Holofernes drank to excess and she, with the help of her maid, cut his head off and this led to the end of Assyrian captivity. There are at least two reasons why mere washing makes more sense than submergence. First, the fountain was located in the camp and more than likely in the middle of the camp, which is one of the reasons why the Assyrians had camped around it. Since the camp was overrun by Assyrians, there were many of them camped right around the fountain. Thus, it does not seem likely that a lady of the nobility of Judith would go to the fountain and bath in it in front of hundreds of Assyrian soldiers.

Secondly, fountains of the sort that one could submerge the entire body into were very rare in this part of the world at that time. More than likely it was a well, and if not, it was a natural spring, but in either case, the odds are against there having been a basin in which the water was collected of a sufficient amount to dip the entire body in. Additionally, it is unreasonable to assume that if there had been a collecting reservoir or basin that any individual would have been allowed to bath in the camp's drinking water. Thus, there are several major discrepancies if the word *baptizo* can only mean *to dip.*

The other Septuagint passage was in Sirach 34:27, where the Greek reads *baptizomenos apo*

nekrou, or literally, "baptized from a dead body." This passage is in reference to being purified after touching a dead body. We learn in Numbers 19:11-13 that the correct method for doing this is to sprinkle the ashes of a heifer.

> **"He that touches the dead body of any man, shall be unclean seven days. He shall be purified on the third day and the seventh day, he shall not be clean. Every one that touches the carcase of the person of a man, if he should have died, and the other not have been purified, has defiled the tabernacle of the Lord: that soul shall be cut off from Israel, because the water of sprinkling has not been sprinkled upon him; he is unclean; his uncleanness is yet upon him"** (LXX).

This water of separation is said to be that water in which the ashes of a red heifer had been mingled in, and it was the sprinkling of this water that purified or *baptized* or better said separated the person who had touched a dead body unto purity. The important thing to note here is that no submergence or dipping of any kind is implied or even possible.

In the New Testament, we find the word *baptein* four times. In Luke 16:24, we read,

> **"And he calling, said, 'Father Abraham, pity me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue, because I am suffering in this flame'"** (AST).

It is obvious here that the word *dip* here does not imply *submergence* for when the tip of the finger

is dipped in water, the finger is not submerged. John 13:26 uses the word *baptein* (or rather the cognates *bapsas* and *embapsas*) twice to describe dipping food. Here again, however, a piece of food held in the fingers is not completely submerged because one would have to dip their fingers in as well so that the entire piece could be submerged. Lastly, the word *bebammenon*, a form of *baptein*, occurs the fourth time in Revelation 19:13 in the phrase *clothed in a garment which had been dipped in blood.*

As for other forms of *baptism* in the New Testament, we find that *baptismos* occurs 4 times, *baptizo* eighty times, and *baptisma* twenty times. In none of these occurrences can any of the words be shown to be in reference to *immersion*. We can divide the passages up into three classes, (1) those passages when read alone and not taken in context seem to imply immersion; (2) those passages in which the idea of *immersion* is excluded; (3) those passages in which sprinkling and pouring are implied.

This first group of passages that seem to imply immersion include those that speak of the object going into the water, usually effected by the particle *eis* or *into*. However, as said before, these passages, such as Matt. 3:16 and Acts 8:38-39 imply immersion only if they are taken by themselves out of context. Thus, we must remember the historical context. According to ancient texts, the most common method of baptism was for the person to step into (*eis*) the water or a running stream and then water would be poured or sprinkled over the head. Whether this was an authentic method or not, it does serve to show that many other methods of *baptism* might have been possible that could be described with the word *eis* other than immersion.

There are many other arguments to be made in this respect as well such as in Matthew 3:5-6, where we read,

"Then Jerusalem and all Judea went out to him, and all the neighborhood of the Jordan; and were baptized in the Jordan by him, having confessed their failures" (AST).

Physical limitations make it improbable that John could have immersed all of these people in the Jordan. Thus, for each passage in this first group, there is no conclusive proof in any one of them that it is in reference to immersion.

The second group of passages are those in which immersion is excluded for one reason or another. Among these are those in reference to the Baptism of the Spirit or Mentality. The Spirit or Mentality is often said to be poured out on men, and this idea may not necessarily imply literal effusion but it certainly rules out immersion. The phrase *baptism with the Holy Spirit* or *Mentality of Separation* often employs the preposition *en* showing that the Mentality of Separation is the instrumental force. This is also true of the phrase *baptism of fire* where we have *en puri* showing again that *fire* is the instrumental force in effecting the baptism. Thus, as we have said before, in this second group of passages we see those words that exclude the idea of immersion but at the same time do not necessarily imply an alternate mode.

In Acts 1:5, we read,

"For John indeed baptized with water, but you will be baptized in the Mentality of Separation not many days after" (AST).

Baptizein in this passage does not express any specific mode by which the end result is to be carried out. In Mark 7:4, we read,

> **"And they do not eat from the marketplace unless they wash themselves. And there are many other things which they received to hold: washing of cups, and of pitchers, and of bronze vessels ..."** (AST).

Wash here is translated for *baptisontai,* and it is ludicrous to assume that whole couches would be immersed. It is clear in this passage that this group of words carry the meaning of *to wash* without particular reference to the mode, although immersion is certainly excluded.

Our third group of passages are those which imply some form of effusion and exclude the idea of immersion. These passages generally exclude immersion for one or more of the following reasons: (1) there were very few private baths in Jerusalem and Palestine; (2) in passages where large groups of people are said to be baptized, immersion is usually made impossible by the overwhelming scarcity of large amounts of water in Jerusalem and Palestine, such as in Acts 2:41 where 3,000 people are said to have been baptized in one day in June in Jerusalem, where there were no running streams during the summer except for one very small stream; (3) in the Latin for these passages, the Greek *baptizo* is transliterated into the Latin verb *baptizo* and never by the Latin verb *immergo*, thus showing that the terms were not considered synonymous and that there was some quality in *baptizo* that could not be expressed in *immergo* and

vice-versa; (4) and lastly, although a great number of the early churches were corrupted, what is found universally among them are small baptismal pools or fonts not large enough to submerse a person.

Other individual problems are found with many passages that forbid the idea of immersion. In the case of the Centurion in Cæsarea, Peter says, **"Can anyone forbid the water?"** (Acts 10:47 AST) which clearly shows that water was to be taken to Cornelius and not the other way around, thus showing it illogical that a basin with enough water to submerge him into would be brought to him.

There is another aspect to this kind of account, wherein water is mentioned to be considered, since there is no actual description of Cornelius receiving a physical ritual of water separation, although it appears to be implied. Nevertheless, if Peter's statement, **"Can anyone forbid the water"** was in reference to the bread of the children or the receiving of the water of Christ, that is, the water of the Word, then it would suggest very clearly that even though Cornelius and his family may have been separated by sprinkling, this separation would have been indicative of receiving the Water of Life, which is Christ. This case becomes stronger when we read the words of Peter by way of explaining the actual intent and meaning of the separating ritual of water washing or baptism (I Peter 3:18-21 AST):

> **"Because even the Anointed once suffered concerning our failures, the Just for the unjustified, that He might bring you to God, indeed, being put to death in the flesh, but made alive in the Mentality, in which also, going into the mentalities in prison, He then proclaimed to disobeying ones, when once the**

long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, an ark having been prepared in which a few, that is, eight lives, were saved through water. Which figure now also saves us, baptism, not a putting away of the filth of the flesh but a pledge from a good conscience toward God through the resurrection of Jesus Anointed."

Thus, there is more than good reason to take Peter's statement in Acts metaphorically rather than literally. What is certain is that the water ritual of separation employed was the common and Scripturally sanctioned practice of the Israelites of sprinkling and pouring. No full-body immersion is implied in this account.

Much the same can be said of the account of the jailer at Philippi (Acts 16:33). Here we read that he and his family were baptized within the jail at midnight. In Acts 8:27-38, we read of the eunuch being baptized by Philip on the way to Gaza which is through a desert country. We are told that they came to "some water" where the baptism took place. There are no known streams in this region of sufficient depth to submerge someone.

Thus, in the New Testament, there is not one verse that demands immersion or, when read in context, even implies it, and beyond this, there are many cases where immersion is obviously unallowable. Furthermore, if immersion were the only allowable method then the Greek word *kataduo* could have been used and if sprinkling were the only allowable method then the Greek word *raino* or *rantizo* could have been used. Instead, however, what we find is that the *baptism* family of words implied no particular method but even still the method was

limited to effusion, which can only include sprinkling, pouring, or anointing, and excluded full-body immersion. Thus, in most cases, there is no word with which to translate *baptizo* other than some form of our English *baptize*, which does not imply *immersion* or any other particular mode or method.

Those who practice full-body immersion as a "sacrament" of the Church or Christian faith at this point in history are primarily represented by two theological schools of thought in the interpretation of the meaning of baptism by immersion. On one hand, there are those immersionists who hold and teach the doctrine that baptism, by immersion, represents participating in the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Their interpretation of the doctrine holds that the full-body mode of immersion baptism signifies, in the Church, that the candidate of water baptism is declaring him or herself to Christ, to die to sin and to be buried with Him under the water, to come out from under the water to the newness of life, and therefore signifies the hope of the resurrection of the physical body at some indefinite time in the future, as opposed to a spiritual resurrection in the present, which in their doctrine, is the time of regeneration. In other words, those who teach the necessity of full-body immersion are, in truth, teaching water baptismal regeneration. But as we shall see, these statements are predicated upon dangerous half-truths and erroneous assumptions and interpretations offered under the guise of fundamentalist Christianity.

This school of immersion generally holds that baptism by full-body immersion is the way in which people are admitted into the visible or militant Church, and while we may indeed agree that the ordinance of Biblical Baptism, which is an act of

separation, is the way into the visible Militant Church as an act of confessing Christ we cannot agree that full-body immersion has anything whatsoever to do with true Christian Baptism. Full-body immersion baptism to them is therefore how you join the Church, or better said, become initiated into their occult. They, of course, hold that their religious organization is the visible Church, and therefore, the governing body of Christ in the physical world. They do not teach that baptism holds any more significance than these basic points. They generally hold that a person is "saved" when he or she "is born again" and makes a public profession of faith, regardless of race, personal belief system or sexual orientation.

Thus, water baptism by full-body immersion, for these Libertine Baptists, is primarily a declaration of faith in their own theology. Water baptism is the way and means of being admitted or joining to obtain one's letter into their visible Church organization. For most such groups, it is much the same as joining a social club.

The problems with this view are many. First, the view, teaching, or doctrine makes no clear distinction between the operation of the Holy Spirit of the Heavenly Father adding to the Church and the ritualistic initiation into a cultic organization posing as a Christian group. In addition to this, the false view of the meaning of Christian baptism is often coupled with false eschatological views and results in the denial of the present Government of the Living God on Earth. Likewise, this view is designed to conceal the actual meaning of the word "church", which really means "called out or separated body politic." By this means of subtle deception it has perpetuated the Roman Catholic doctrine of an

ecclesiastical hierarchy investing all such powers in "the pastor" who corresponds to the "infallible pope of Rome," as well as establishing the ancient pagan doctrine of water baptismal regeneration. The deacons in these Libertine Baptist churches sometimes answer to the Pope's Cardinals as the behind-the-scenes power structure and in most Libertine Baptist churches the Board of Deacons is usually controlled by the Humanist secret society of so-called Freemasons – assuming, of course, that the pastor himself is not a Freemason, though they most usually are. This Libertine Baptist philosophy demands of its baptismal candidates, as an implied article of faith, that the candidate believe that the respective religious organization or church can put the candidate into the "called out ones" or "body politic." Most people are too Biblically ignorant to question this teaching and are drawn into the strong illusion as innocent lambs.

In addition to this, each initiate must relinquish his personal rights of exegesis to the organization. This is the great tragedy perpetuated by religious organizations that leave the order and pattern of the Word of God. Let us set aside our discussion of the Libertine Baptists at this point to look into God's Word and see if their teaching holds water before returning to discuss their other explicit and implied teachings surrounding the heresy of full-body immersion.

Buried With Christ Through Baptism

In Roman 6:3-7 (AST) we read:

"Or are you ignorant that all who were baptized into Anointed Jesus were baptized into His death? Then we were buried with Him through the baptism into death, that as the Anointed was raised from the dead through the reputation of the Father, so also we might walk in newness of life. For if we have become united in the likeness of His death, but also shall we be of the resurrection. Knowing this, that our old man was crucified with Him, that the body of failure might be annulled, so that we no longer serve failure. For the One having died has been justified from failure."

And in Colossians 2:12 (AST) we further read **"being buried with Him in the baptism."** In these scriptures we find the best arguments of our Libertine Baptists. Let us notice carefully that neither passage has a single drop of water in it. Notice carefully also that it is "buried into death" and not into water. Both of these scriptures, especially when read in the Greek, are talking about the same thing. In Colossians 2:12 we see that the soul, in reference to the inner-man, is raised through **"the working of God."** The working of God is in reference to the mind-renewing work of the Holy Mentality or the Spirit of Truth. It is not in reference to something men can do, but only to what the pure Word of God can do. It says nothing of our bodies being raised out of water through the

physical strength of a Libertine priest or preacher. These scriptures are talking about the work of the Spirit of Favor and Truth, the Separating Baptism of Fire, Whose work it is to separate us from sin and makes us alive unto the living God. These passages are to be understood as figurative language. They were never intended to be taken literally in the physical sense. They have no more literal meaning of being dunked under water than any other figurative passages of scripture such as "crucified with Christ." If we break the same Greek rules the Libertine Baptist break in interpreting "buried with Christ" and apply their same reasoning to "crucified with Christ," then this would mean that we are to be literally nailed to a piece of wood. Much the same may be said when it comes to the Word "resurrection" and the phrase "raise up from the dead." In Romans 6:4-5 this would have to mean a literal resurrection of the body.

The Apostle Paul says "we were buried with Him" in the sense that we have died to the Jewish and pagan world order, not that we are "buried in water." To literally represent Christ's burial, the body of the Baptismal candidate would have to be left under the water three days and three nights. So we see there is a great difference between being buried with Christ by Baptism of Fire unto His death and being buried under water by a pagan water ritual and a deceived "preacher." In the Greek it is clear that what Paul is speaking of here is the same Baptism spoken of in Luke 12:50 which is the Baptism of suffering and death, the end product of the Baptism of Fire, because it is certain that all who will live godly will suffer persecution from the antichrists of this world and be hated by all ungodly men (II Tim. 3:12). The full-body immersionists

deceive the people by teaching that the Greek word *baptiso* always means *immersion.* Greek scholars appear to be divided on this point, primarily because the Baptist cultists have produced their own "Greek scholars," to back up their own Scriptural theories. As a result the average person is ill-equipped to overcome the flood of propagandizing books and pamphlets that cite the dishonest men as authorities. The answer to this modern dilemma is in truth a simple answer. Go back to the original evidence of the classical and Biblical use of the Greek language and do so in light of the great wealth of information that true modern scholarship affords us today. This is to focus on the real issue and should serve as a warning of clear and present danger to any truth seeker; and must serve to alert the diligent Bible student to the dishonesty and danger of Baptist scholarship, especially since a great number of so-called Greek scholars are Judeo Baptists and should be seen to be products of their own denominationalism and compromisers of their own intellectual integrity.

The real issue is – how was the word *baptiso* employed by the early Christians in the context of the Scripture? It therefore becomes important to let the Old and New Testaments define their own use and meaning of the word. The true issue is how much of the body of the Christian believer is to be symbolically separated, washed, or immersed in water and what does that washing or baptism signify and mean? As Separatist Christians, we understand that the Greek language must be interpreted in the context in which it is used. In other words, the Bible must be allowed to define its use of language. This means that we believe that wherein language is concerned, the Bible is self-

defining.

There is no Scriptural basis for full-body immersion. Later in this discussion we will come back to this issue and show you from the Scriptures the very picture of at least two true Christian baptisms.

As we have seen, the explicit, as well as the implied, teaching of the Libertine Baptists is that regeneration in the resurrection for the believer is not a present reality, but is to be realized some time in the future. This comes from their perverted eschatology. These positions force the Libertine Baptists to seek other points of time, that is, other than "baptism", when the believer becomes alive unto God and a member of the brotherhood. As a consequence, the clear Bible teaching on baptism as well as faith toward God and the precise moment of regeneration – that is, when the Bible teaches that all true believers receive eternal life – becomes unclear to them. In effect, the Bible becomes a closed book and beyond their full understanding, not because the Bible is not understandable, but because their preconceived notions and brain-washing in the doctrines and teachings of Babylon prevent them from hearing the simple truth of the present Government of God.

Again, the tragedy of the Libertine Baptist view is that it perpetuates confusion throughout the white race. The same may be said of those who practice effusion as an act of regeneration. Because of these two predominant views and their inability to answer basic Bible questions, they have indirectly caused thousands of other unbiblical views to be set in motion, and as an ever-increasing number of the blind come forward to lead the blind, it is no wonder that so many have fallen into the ditch of

deception and that an ever increasing number come forward to seek to counterfeit the true Bible message of the sons of God. Therefore, as a result of this condition, people throughout the Adamic nations are still seeking to understand what is the one, true baptism of Scripture. Money-preachers will not tell them because they cannot tell them for they simply do not know. They have sold their birthright for the Almighty Dollar. Therefore, in their arrogance, they have misrepresented the simple truth of the meaning of baptism. I might add that this is true of almost every other doctrine in the Babylon of confusion which we call "organized religion" or Christianity. For these reasons, the children of God are held in bondage and need to be set free by the truth of God's Word.

Professional religionists have literally made great capital of the mysteries in God's Word. But their efforts have simply been directed toward perpetuating confusion, destroying unity, and making merchandise of the people.

This study will show that the false interpretations and teachings promoted by the full-body immersionists cause them to pervert other elementary or basic Christian truths of the common faith, and in the process, destroy the common faith. At the same time, they destroy the uniqueness of the common salvation.

Libertine Baptists are generally opposed to baptizing infants and small children. They hold to the doctrine of "the age of accountability" and "original sin." They teach that the patriarchal system of the Everlasting Covenant has somehow been done away with but they never bother to prove it in spite of the fact that Christians are commanded to prove all things (I Thess. 5:21). To them, no father

would have the right to baptize or separate through dedication his own child, in his own household. All ecclesiastical power is vested in the "church," who, practically speaking, is the pastor – be that "church" or pastor corrupt or not. Libertine Baptists are also identified by their teaching and support of the Talmudic Jews, as the "chosen people of God." They make no distinction between the two kingdoms of Israel. We believe that the true church of God, the called-ones of God, the Christians, are the true Israel, rulers with God, and are God's chosen people, as they identify with Christ in the adoption of our Father. Moreover, as Separatist Christians we believe that only Christ has the right to interpret the Scriptures. We believe that no man can come to the Father except through Christ, that He is the Door and the Way and the true Vine.

We believe that there is but one, true church, with its government in heaven. It is perfect and incorruptible. No one can join "the church," the "called out" or "separated ones." Almighty God must put a person in the Victorious Church – the Mount Zion of God. We believe that the church is an organism, made up of a specific race, not an organization at Rome or even a community building. For we believe the Head of the church, the body of Christ, is Jesus the Anointed One.

It should be made clear that there are many kinds of Baptist sects. While there may be Baptist sects that deviate somewhat from the Libertine Baptists' interpretation, the majority of immersionists are Libertine Baptists.

On the other hand, there is a more extreme militant school of theological thought we must call the militant immersionists. This school of theological thought came into prominence, at least as a militant

minority, about a hundred years after the beginning of the reformation in the doctrines of the German Brethren, Dunkards, or Anabaptists.

According to the Columbia Encyclopedia:

> "...Since 1644 the name has been applied to those who maintain that baptism should be administered to none but a believer, and that immersion is the only mode of administering baptism indicated in the New Testament. The doctrine and practices of some earlier bodies, such as the Anabaptists and Mennonites, were similar."

In Holland a group of Separatists, led by John Smyth (escaped from persecution in England), came under Mennonite influence and formed, in Amsterdam in 1608, the first English Baptist Church. Smyth baptized himself first, then the others. In 1611, certain of these English Baptists returned to London and established a church there. This was the first of the churches afterwards known as General Baptist, since they held the Arminean belief that the atonement of Christ is not limited to the elect only but is general.

Particular Baptist were those whose doctrine was Calvinistic, teaching that atonement is particular or individual. The first such church was formed by secession, in 1638, from a Separatist congregation in Southwark, London. Immersion was not yet insisted upon in these churches, but in 1644 seven Particular Baptist churches issued a Confession of Faith requiring the full-body immersion form of baptism, and Baptist was thenceforth the name given to those who practiced it. A general assembly of General Baptist churches was formed in 1671; of

Particular Baptist churches, in 1689. In 1891 General and Particular Baptists united. In was the Particular type that first took root to further corrupt the Puritans and Calvinists in America, when Roger Williams and his companions in Rhode Island rejected infant baptism and established a church in 1639.

However, in this century it has been represented most vigorously by followers of Alexander Campbell, as well as many Pentecostal-oriented groups. These militant, conservative immersionists hold much the same point-of-view as the Libertine Baptist, but with the added difference that they hold and teach (at least by implication) that Baptism, by full-body immersion, is the moment of regeneration. What makes them different is that they hold up a false doctrinal standard in that they teach that anyone, regardless of race, creed, or color who is baptized according to their interpretation, is a child of the Living God. They distort the doctrine of the closed communion in Christ.

Thus, some of the militant Baptists apply the Roman Catholic interpretation of baptismal regeneration to full-body immersion. In addition to this, the militants generally hold that persons not baptized into their church or religious organization by a "qualified preacher" cannot be saved.

While some find it advantageous to be flexible upon the definition of "qualified preacher," all are fanatical when it comes to the mode of baptism. The teaching is very simple — if a person is not full-body immersed, they have not been baptized. It is this one point of attributing the authority and mode of baptism to a religious organization, that the Libertine Baptists and the Militant Baptists hold in common. Therefore, in the truest sense, all full-

body immersionists are militant Baptists, and all subscribe to the Jewish Talmudic doctrine of the universal fatherhood of God and the universal brotherhood of man.

As we have mentioned, there are many other religious organizations within the Protestant camp of churches who practice the mode of baptism by full-body immersion who do not take the name "Baptist," who differ on other doctrinal issues, but who are in agreement on the immersionists' mode of baptism, and would be considered to be under the Holiness or Pentecostal banner. These include the Churches of God, Assemblies of God, Full-Gospel Fellowships, etc.

Still, immersion engulfs a wide variety of doctrinal points-of-view including Sabturianism represented by such organizations as Seventh Day Baptists, Seventh Day Adventists and Armstrongism, all the way to Zionistic organizations, such as Jehovah's Witnesses, and others. The doctrine covers monotheism, Trinitarianism, pre-, mid-, post, and a- millenialism, etc. In general, it covers Christianity like a flood of foul water, flowing directly from ancient Babylon and contaminating all in its tide. It has its appeal in dried up intellectualism, will worship, sentimental emotionalism, etc. It is to be found under many guises and in many variations. It is the counterfeit water of Babylon that the Devil and his angels use to keep off balance the children of God while having them war and fight with each other and calling one another a cult, while destroying their race and them as a people. It is for this reason that our Father demands for the children of God to **"come out from among them, and separate, mark off your boundaries and cast them out of your**

society, and do not have sexual intercourse with an adulterated mongrel, and I will receive you" (II Corinthians 6:17 AST).

Thus, the practice of full-body baptism by immersion crosses many doctrinal lines. In many cases it is the only doctrinal interpretation that some religious organizations agree upon at all. The unbiblical and extreme views of the full-body immersionists have caused one other condition to exist in "Christendom." Their militancy has given rise to another extreme view on the subject of baptism which must be defined as "abaptist" or "non-Baptist". This school of thought is primarily represented by the Society of Friends, better known as the Quakers. While participation is left to the individual's conscience, still as an organization of "God's children," they have gone to an extreme and rejected the necessity of any kind of baptism altogether. As a consequence, many of the Friends do not believe that there is any kind of Biblical baptism that is necessary for entrance into the rule or Government of Heaven in spite of clear, emphatic, and unmistakable statements that demand it. Their error, of course, is that they make no distinction between the Heavenly Government wherein God rules His subjects by His Word, and the administration of a local assembly or Church Militant.

Bible Does Not Teach Full-body Immersion

As astonishing as it may be to some, the Bible does not teach full-body immersion. It should be made clear that we Separatist Christians are not questioning the sincerity or the good moral character of many of those who teach full-body immersion. Nor do we question the fact that the word "baptiso," in the oldest Greek writings does indeed carry the meaning to dip or immerse. Nevertheless, this work will show that the doctrine of full-body immersion is not taught in the Christian faith, but in fact is a Persian or Iranian doctrine that was taught and practiced among those people the Bible designates as the Babylonians, some 500 years before the advent of Jesus Christ. Full-body immersion was in fact the mode of baptism or the sacred rite of the pagan cults and was adopted by the Talmudic Jews of Palestine, known as the "fathers of baptism". However, full-body immersion was never the mode of baptism for the true Israelites or for the early Christians.

In effect, those who are practicing full-body immersion are practicing Zoroastrianism, Mithraism, and Isisism, or what can only be called a false Babylonian Christianity. In this work our objective is to bring forth the Bible truth and to let the Bible speak for itself. For this reason and because those who will believe the Word of God need only to hear the truth, we shall spend little time repudiating the alleged teachings of Zoroaster. In point of fact, the literature available for the study of Zoroastrians is limited to a few hymns and open to a variety of interpretations. For those who will look into the

subject, they will find that a great deal more is made of Zoroastrianism than the evidence calls for, usually from an antichristian point of view.

Zoroaster is herein mentioned because he allegedly reformed the religion of Iran or Persia with his monotheistic doctrine and is said by the Jews to have affected such reform as to cause the mystery religion of Mithra to be the ideological parent of Christianity. And while it is true that Mithraism, by the first century, was indeed that mystery of iniquity already at work and was one of the chief philosophical competitors of Christianity, it could hardly be described as an ideological parent to Christianity. Persian Zoroastrians upheld the practice of incestuous relations within the family. The Jewish Talmud also subscribes to this immoral and destructive principle, while the Christian writings strictly forbid such degenerating practices. It is interesting that the same people who make this claim have also claimed that Christ never existed at all. Some of these same people have claimed that Mary was raped by a Roman soldier and that Jesus was simply a lunatic and should be boiled in His own excrement — all in an effort to destroy the faith of many and bring about the demise of the white race, yes, even some who had been delivered from mystery Babylon. The same people that pervert the reality of Zoroastrianism to try and connect it with Christianity are the same people who attack the historical existence of Jesus Christ, but ironically, the Talmudists provide one of the greatest proofs of the historical existence of Jesus Christ by mentioning Jesus Christ in their Talmud.

There has been an organized attempt on the part of the "Babylonian Jews" to merge Christianity with pagan mystery religions for the last 2000 years.

Many have had their faith destroyed by this godless and evil seed, because it is always the objective of the Babylonian, Christ-hating Jews to destroy the truth that proclaims the deity of Christ. The Babylonian mentality or spirit will receive with open arms any Satanic practice that the Christians, called *goyim* by the Jews, can be duped into thinking is part of Christianity, and thereby destroy the continuity and uniqueness of the common Christian faith in the Everlasting Covenant of Christ. God is not the author of confusion, but living, breathing devils are. Thus, the importance of continuing in His Word.

The truth on any subject is in God's word. All God has ever asked of His people is to believe His Word. But the churches have relinquished, abandoned, and given up their right of exegesis, as individuals, to a Babylonian hierarchy who more often than not receive their revelation, not from the Spirit of Truth, but from a Satanic spirit in a secret meeting chamber or perhaps from a pamphlet originating in Jew York City or Tel Aviv, be it Catholic or Protestant.

It is Time to Expose

It is now time to expose all that has been hidden to the light of truth, because the light of truth will cause the hideous vines of Babylon to wither and shrivel so that the ax of God can dislodge it and throw it into the fire. Only Bible truth, without adding anything to it or taking anything from it, only that truth that lifts up the standard of the "little book", will be successful in tearing down the middle partitions that have been re-erected out of stumbling blocks to divide and conquer the kingdom and destroy the white race, to block the way across the straight and narrow path of salvation. The truth will cause Babylon to shrivel in size, by exposure to the Light of Truth, that the final battle may be won. The kingdom must be united upon the truth of God's Word, for it is certain that it will not be united upon the vain speculations of men who want to put new wine in old bottles.

We shall now show the Babylonian theories to be absolute lies created by the dark illuminati as antichristian propaganda. The evidence would indicate that Zoroaster may have been the son of one of the ten tribes of Israel, that is of the Northern Kingdom, who seceded from the commonwealth in 938 B.C. This explains his monotheism, as well as many of the conceptions of God held by many of the pagan nations that surrounded Israel.

However, Zoroaster's self-willed missionary work was a failure. Soon the light that he had was corrupted. It seems evident that he had stepped out of the will and purpose of God beyond the set

boundaries. He may well have been a good and decent man, "sincere as a heart attack," but his missionary zeal was not in the plan and purpose of the Father.

We shall now trace from the Old Testament through the New Testament the true Bible meaning of Baptism. In the process we shall find an astounding uniqueness characterizing, not only the Hebrews, but also the Christian faith.

The Historical Background

Let us begin our examination of the historical facts of our subject by considering the possible sources of the rite of baptism that John the Baptist practiced.

First, let us consider the practice of baptism in the pagan world. At the time of John, the pagan world was well acquainted with the practice of baptism by full-body immersion. Baptism was the way in which the candidate or initiate entered many, if not most of the pagan mystery religions. It was through baptism that the initiate entered the worship of Isis, Mithra and the famous Eleusinian mysteries, as Tertullian (c. 150-c. 230), who was one of the so-called "church fathers," mentions. Clement of Alexandria (died c. 215), another early Church father and the teacher of Origen, tells us that lustrations, that is, washing or purification, led the premier place in the mystery ceremonies. The worshippers of Dionysius also had to experience "the pure washings", as Livy (59 B.C.-A.D. 17), the Roman historian, tells it.

When Apuleius, a 2nd Century Latin writer, speaks of his own initiation, he tells that the officiating pagan priest brought him to the baths and, demanding pardon of the gods, washed him and purified his body, according to custom. The ancient records show clearly that the pagan world was not only very familiar with full-body immersion, but required it as an entry into the mystery pagan religions in which the worshippers "sought to find gods".

All the pagan religions that required baptism or purifications practiced baptism by full-body

immersion. John the Baptist or the Purifier, on the other hand, was a devout Israelite-Judean. The Alexandrian Israelite Philo tells us clearly that "It was customary for the Judeans to sprinkle themselves with river water."

John the Baptist was related directly to Jesus Christ, for he was the son of Elizabeth, the kinswoman of Mary (Luke 1:36). He had been born to Zacharias, a priest, and to Elizabeth, in the days of their old age when all hope and expectation of a child had gone (Luke 1:5, 25, 57-80). Both of John's parents were blood line descendants of Aaron. God had made it clear to his parents, even before John was born, that he was to be no ordinary child, nor would he be an ordinary man. While still in the womb of his mother, the fetus leaped for joy at the news of the conception of "The Anointed One of Israel". And we are told that John the Baptist came to manhood in the solitude of the desert and in the lonely places (Luke 1:80). It is clear that John was not only destined to inherit the authority of the Levitical priesthood, but he was also separated by God into the wilderness to live the life and to wear the clothes of a prophet.

As we study the New Testament, our first vivid scenes of the mature John the Separator are those of a man preaching repentance "for the kingdom [government or rule] of God is at hand." We are told of his birth, we know of his travels in the desert, we know that he emerges as the baptizer of crowds of people in the River Jordan, but as to his ministerial training or where he learned his message or what mode of baptism he practiced, this is not dealt with in explicit terms in the New Testament.

These facts have opened the door for speculation, especially by those who teach that Israel

ceased to exist as the people of God when the church or the body politic of Christ was established. This false doctrine, more than any other, is responsible for the confusion and division in Christianity today.

To find the truth to any question we must study the Bible in total context, line upon line, precept upon precept, finding a little truth here and a little truth there, not adding to it or taking away from it. God has commanded that His Word be studied unto His approval. Thus, it may be said that God takes it for granted that His people, who are called by His name, His authority, will have obeyed Him and studied His Word in total context. They would know that it was against the law of God for the devout Judeans and Israelites (true worshippers of God) to baptize in any other way besides pouring and sprinkling. In fact, it was a rigid article of faith that separated them in their practice of religion from the pagan nations around them. John was no law breaker. The New Testament does deal with these questions in terms of inference. Thus, the Word of God does answer these questions in terms of inference for those who will **"let God be true and every man a liar."**

The fact that John was a distant kinsman or cousin of Jesus of Nazareth, and a son of a Levitical priest – therefore a devout Israelite and living under the Everlasting Covenant and under the law of Moses – presupposes that you and I as Christians have studied the Levitical law, and that we understand and know that devout Judeans did not practice baptism by immersion. The fact that John's father was a priest makes it clear that John understood the requirements of the law. While John may have had knowledge of the pagan practices of

the mystery cult religions, to teach that John baptized by immersion is to teach that John was engaging in pagan practices, a law breaker, therefore, a false prophet, a false priest with no authority from God, which makes his testimony regarding Jesus Christ questionable. To teach that John practiced pagan immersion is like teaching that he was never circumcised or that he did not keep the law regarding sacrifice or sin offerings.

It becomes obvious that we need to understand the importance of the message of John the Baptist, the herald or the forerunner of Jesus Christ. It was his mission to prepare the way for the Anointed One. John's message was to repent, that the Kingdom of God was at hand or near. A new order of government was soon to take place. The Chosen One or God in the flesh, the Deliverer, was soon to come. John's message or ministry was not for the pagan world, but it was for Judea-Israel and dispersed Israel (whom God had entrusted with His oracles), as well as for Israelites near and far off, that is those scattered among the pagan nations. Hence the importance of the Identity message.

It therefore becomes important that we understand that John was baptizing Israelites and Judea-Israel. Some have suggested that John was baptizing pagan proselytes, because it is said that the Jewish religious establishment, that is, a small percentage of some of the Scribes and Pharisees (who had at that time adopted the Babylonian Talmud) had begun the practice of requiring pagan full-body immersion baptism of pagans who had been converted or proselytized to the corrupt religious establishment of Judaism that Jesus came to do away with. Those Scribes and Pharisees who advocated requiring pagan baptism of pagan

converts were without any legal authority according to the majority of the religious establishment of the Judean denomination themselves.

At the time of Christ, the corrupt Babylonian Jews had not succeeded in corrupting all of the Israelites in Palestine, especially in the rite of purifications. The Mosaic law still prevailed, though it is clear that the Babylonians were doing all in their power to corrupt even Moses' law of purification as given by the Eternal. That which did corrupt Judea-Israel was the practice of the scribes, who, in their arrogance, added their interpretations of the law of God, that is, the traditions of the elders, to the original law of God. It was for that and racial reasons that Jesus denounced the Scribes and Pharisees as being the sons of their father the devil. For Christ and His Apostles, the proof was in the tasting of the pudding. All devils will do the work of their father. Therefore, we understand that those Jews who sought to merge paganism and Yahwehism were an abomination unto the Everliving God. The devil and his seed do not have any spark of true creativity. The only thing that they can do is corrupt that which is already created.

It becomes very clear that their lawless practices can in no way be applied to John the Baptist or Christ. John the Baptist and Jesus Christ were not in any way pagan, but were both faithful Covenant law-keepers. Nor did they practice the corrupt Jewish religion of that day. This in itself is proof that the mode of baptism that John practiced was not full-body immersion. Some turn in their Bibles to read, out of context, that Jesus did defied the law, but this simply is not true. The laws that he defied were the man-made rituals, speculations, and ordinances added to the original Word of God by

the seed of Satan. He (Satan) had seized the power, that is, the authority, of the Judean denomination and sought to merge Yahwehism with the pagan mystery religions around them. This is the exact opposite of what you hear proclaimed in the churches today. Could it be that Babylonian Cosmopolitanism has so infiltrated our churches that they can no longer hear the truth of the Bible, or for that matter, the evidence of history? The preservers of the faith were the true Israelites, not those corrupted and adulterated Jews who had jumped in bed with the Babylonian system or economy out of the love of money.

It was not Jesus and John controlling the religion of that day by merging pagan doctrines with Hebrewism, nor were they the ones controlling the banking or usury system, nor where they the ones manipulating the working guilds throughout the Roman Empire through a network of fraternally oriented Babylonian synagogues. As for Jesus, He was a devout Israelite who kept the law of Moses in His generation, until He Himself was destined to establish the law of liberty and would finish His work, by fulfillment of those things written of Him. The proof of this is seen in the study of the life of Jesus. He came under the law at the age of 12. In accordance with the law, He waited until He was 30 years old to begin His public ministry. Jesus was no law breaker. He was sinless and perfect in His obedience to the Father.

When Jesus came to John to be separated, it was not for repentance but rather to be separated as a priest and prophet of Israel. When John objected that he was not worthy to baptize or separate the Christ, Jesus told him that it was necessary for John to perform the ceremony of separation for the

purpose of keeping the law.

"But John restrained Him, saying, 'I have need to be baptized by You, and You come to me?' But Jesus answering, said to him, 'Allow it now, for it is thus fitting to us to fulfill all justice.' Then he allowed Him. And being baptized, Jesus went up at once from the water. And behold, the heavens were opened [to Him], and He saw the Mentality of God descending as a dove, and coming upon Him. And behold, a voice out of the heavens, saying, 'This is My Son, the Beloved, in Whom I have found delight'" (Matthew 3:14-17 AST).

No rational person can deny that the law that Christ was fulfilling was the Levitical law. No Christian can deny these explicit statements of Christ, for if Christ did not fulfill the Levitical law and if John did not deliver unto Him all prophetical and priestly authority, then Christianity has no authority from God the Father. What this means is that for a person who professes to be a Christian to say that Jesus was not keeping the Levitical law, which He came to fulfill, is to call Jesus Christ a liar and to blaspheme the Holy Spirit of the Living God. In effect, those who have imposed pagan water rituals and Jewish theology upon Christianity are liars and blasphemers, and though they may think that they have eternal life, nevertheless the Scriptures say that no liar has eternal life abiding in him. All of the perverted theology of the late 20th Century is easily traced to the mongrelized mind of the Jew.

It is small wonder that those who have no proof

for their perverted theology from the Scripture always argue that the mode of baptism is after all not important. But the God of Israel is a jealous God and He demands that His people walk in obedience according to His Word. Today, the perverted, mongrel-minded, Jewish theologians have all but destroyed every Christian state, and the chosen race of the white race now stands in jeopardy of the death of mongrelization, because to deviate from the Word of God is to be a deviate. To claim teachings that are not authorized by the Word of the Living God is to be out of the Will of God and to be teaching another gospel. As Separatist Christians, we believe that it is our duty to adjust ourselves to the just judgments, norms, and standards of the Word of Truth, and like on so many issues, when men stick to what the Scriptures actually teach, they will find that the Scriptures expose the mongrel minds of the God-hating Jews to be the parasitical force and the thief that, like their father, comes but to steal, kill, and destroy. To call Jesus Christ or John the Baptist law-breakers is nothing but blasphemy, for it is to call the Holy Spirit of Truth a liar and contribute the works of Satan to the Spirit of Truth.

As we have already made mention, all Bible scholars agree that among the Talmudic Jews there were some Rabbis who had begun and had formulated a baptismal ritual strictly designed for Jewish proselytes. Jewish proselyte baptism was carried out in the presence of three witnesses – if possible, members of the Sanhedrin. The nails and the hair of the candidate were cut, he was stripped naked, he was completely immersed in water so that his whole body was totally covered. Portions of the law were read out of context to the proselyte. He

was warned of the difficulties and the dangers and the possible persecutions which lay ahead of him. He confessed his sins to a representative of the men who were known as "the fathers of baptism," and who corresponded to god-parents. After blessings and exhortations, he emerged a Jew.

His loyalty was re-enforced no doubt with promises of sharing in the controlled wealth and the open doors of opportunity that his new religion and position in the Jewish brotherhood now afforded him. It is interesting that the sales-pitch has not changed. As to whether or not the proselyte's conversion was re-enforced by such implied opportunities is only a conclusion of common sense, since it is a historical fact that the Zionistic Jews of that period controlled perhaps the largest banking and usury system in the Roman empire. They indirectly controlled a great percentage of the working guilds throughout the empire, and possessed a great deal of political clout and power in Rome itself. History leaves little doubt that their philosophy was Zionist in nature and practice.

The Talmudic Jewish Rabbis Argued

The Jewish rabbis argued that this process was said to result in the convert the most absolute change, he was "born again". It was said to constitute the nature of the new birth. He was said to emerge as "a little child just born," "a child of one day" of the mixed Jewish race. So completely was he a new man, as was theologically argued by the arrogant Rabbis, that a proselyte, who had been immersed in this fashion, might marry his own sister or his own mother, because for the proselyte, they, the Talmudic Jews, contended that the connection with the past was completely severed and broken, not only religiously but maternally and racially.

These arrogant and egotistical Jewish theologians completely set aside God's law, as do modern Judeos, not only regarding God's law against incest, but race-mixing as well. It was an utter corruption of truth, twisted to promote the cosmopolitanism of Babylon. It was such a dangerous perversion of the truth that God would cause the destruction of their system in A.D. 70. Jewish proselyte baptism was no doubt founded in the many washings in which the Hebrew law laid down for the purpose of purification or separations (Leviticus 15:5, 8, 13, 16; 16:26, 28). However, those who studied the Mosaic law practiced by the true Judeans at that time cannot help but see that the lawless Babylonian Jews, who formulated the merger of cosmopolitan paganism with Hebrewism, did so by taking the law of God out of context, a practice that is still continued by lawless and unprinciplistic men, even unto our day.

Please Go To Book 2

Other Christian Separatist Literature Available:

The Anointed Standard Translation of the New Testament, 2nd Edition	648 pgs.	Hardback	$35.00
	648 pgs.	Softback	$25.00
The Apocalypse of Jesus Christ: A Verse by Verse Exegesis		V.S. Herrell	300 pgs. $17.00
The Truth Unveiled		V.S. Herrell	256 pgs. $14.00
Separatist Brief: Volume I		Various Authors	163 pgs. $16.00
Separatist Brief: Volume II		Various Authors	171 pgs. $16.00
Separatist Brief: Volume III		Various Authors	183 pgs. $16.00
The History of the Bible		V.S. Herrell	112 pgs. $5.00
The Sixth Law of God		V.S. Herrell	100 pgs. $5.00
The Septuagint vs. The Masoretic Text		David Tate	88 pgs. $4.50
The Standard of Christian Separatist Unity and Christology		V.S. Herrell	60 pgs. $3.50
The Christian Separatist Manifesto		V.S. Herrell	80 pgs. $4.25
The Justification of God		V.S. Herrell	88 pgs. $4.50
Positive Christianity in the Third Reich		Cajus Fabricius	72 pgs. $4.00
Martin Luther: Select Quotes Concerning the Jews			20 pgs. $2.00
Christ or Religion?		V.S. Herrell	36 pgs. $2.00
The Genesis of Evil		V.S. Herrell	52 pgs. $3.00
***The Racial War at Baal-Peor: A Study in* Pornos**		V.S. Herrell	52 pgs. $3.00
The Joudikoi in Our Midst		V.S. Herrell	56 pgs. $3.25
The Divine Laws of Establishment		V.S. Herrell	60 pgs. $3.50
The Finished Work of Christ* and *Who Are the Innocent?		V.S. Herrell	40 pgs. $2.50
Chr. Sep. Epiphanological and Eschatological Teachings		V.S. Herrell	80 pgs. $4.25
Strong Illusions and Tongues		V.S. Herrell	32 pgs. $2.00
The Baptism of Fire		V.S. Herrell	112 pgs. $6.25
Water Baptism		V.S. Herrell	100 pgs. $5.50
Was Adolf Hitler a Bible Christian?		V.S. Herrell	20 pgs. $2.00
II Corinthians, Chapter 6: A Literal Translation with Notes		V.S. Herrell	56 pgs. $3.25

Order from: Herrell Brothers Publishing House
POB 130, Kodak, TN 37764